

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-23 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 18 and 20 have been amended hereby to correct matters of form. Accordingly, claims 1-23 will remain pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject in claims 2-10, 12-14 and 16-19. However, for the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, an abstract was required, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and claims 1, 11, 15, 20 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 2077634. To the extent these grounds of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

As requested, attached is a new abstract on a separate sheet of paper.

As for the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection, Applicant has amended the claims as set forth above to address the concerns raised in the Office Action and to modify the claims to be more consistent with U.S. practice.

Turning now to the substantive rejection under §102, claim 1 explicitly specifies that an intermediate product is formed that comprises a first portion which shall form the high relief patterned field(s) which however is (are) “**not yet relief patterned** but contain(s) a quantity of material essentially corresponding to the quantity of material existing with said field(s)”.

It is further specified in claim 1 that the intermediate product is placed between two engraved tool parts of which at least one is “high relief engraved” and that the high relief pattern within the regions(s) of said field(s) “is established by striking the engraved tool parts against one another”.

From the foregoing, it is clear that claim 1 requires that the plate be formed in a two-step procedure where the high relief pattern is established during the **second** step and **not** during the first step (the forming of the intermediate product).

In contrast, GB ‘634 discloses a two-stage process where a plate with a grooved profile 28 is formed during a first stage after which cell connections 30 and a lug 32 are formed in a second stage. See Figure 1, page 2, lines 24-42, and page 1, lines 69-71 of GB ‘634. There is **no** indication in GB ‘634 that any contribution to the grooved profile 28 is achieved during the second stage. Therefore, the disclosure of GB ‘634 is **contrary to the explicit language of claim 1**. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the §102 rejection of claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, is improper and should be withdrawn.



Serial No.: 09/890,890
Art Unit: 1731

Attorney's Docket No.: HPX0069-PCT
Page 11

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: January 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

HAKAN OLSSON

By: Lawrence D. Eisen (41,009)
for Michael D. Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

Attachments: Abstract

MDB/LDE/ggb